## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

1

2

Charles Alonzo Yancy,

Plaintiff

v.

United States of America,

Defendant

2:12-cr-00300-JAD-GWF-1

Order Denying Motion to Vacate Sentence Under 28 USC § 2255

[ECF No. 41]

Pro se prisoner Charles Alonzo Yancy brings this § 2255 motion to vacate his 110-month sentence in light of the United States Supreme Court's decision last term in *Johnson v. United States*, in which the Court held that the Armed Career Criminal Act's residual clause is void for vagueness. In 2013, Yancy pleaded guilty to possession of a stolen firearm, and he was sentenced to the

relief because Yancy was not sentenced under the Armed Career Criminal Act, let alone under the

statutory maximum sentence of ten years' imprisonment.<sup>3</sup> Johnson does not provide Yancy any

Act's residual clause invalidated by *Johnson*. If Yancy had been sentenced under the ACCA, he

would have been subjected to a mandatory minimum term of fifteen years' imprisonment. Yancy's

110-month sentence (and the offense of conviction) belie his claim that he was adjudicated an armed

19 career criminal under the ACCA's residual clause, and *Johnson* is thus inapplicable.<sup>4</sup>

2021

22

23

<sup>1</sup> ECF No. 41; *Johnson v. United States*,\_\_U.S.\_\_, 135 S.Ct. 2251, 2258 (2015).

<sup>2</sup> ECF No. 29.

24 SECF No. 38.

2526

27

28

<sup>4</sup> Yancy was originally charged with one count of being a felon in possession of a firearm—an offense that could have potentially subjected him to the ACCA. Yancy ultimately pleaded guilty to the superseding indictment charging him with possession of a stolen firearm, presumably to avoid the ambit of the ACCA. This may be why Yancy believes that *Johnson* applies to his sentence. It may be that *Johnson* undermined the benefit Yancy received under his plea bargain, but because Yancy was not sentenced under the ACCA's residual clause, *Johnson* does not afford him any relief.